arXiv:1409.3957v2 [math.OC] 25 Aug 2015

An Interpretation of the Dual Problem of the THREE-like Approaches ⋆

Mattia Zorzi [a]

[a] *Dipartimento di Ingegneria dell'Informazione, Università degli studi di Padova, via Gradenigo 6/B, 35131 Padova, Italy*

Abstract

Spectral estimation can be preformed using the so called THREE-like approach. Such method leads to a convex optimization problem whose solution is characterized through its dual problem. In this paper, we show that the dual problem can be seen as a new parametric spectral estimation problem. This interpretation implies that the THREE-like solution is optimal in terms of closeness to the correlogram over a certain parametric class of spectral densities, enriching in this way its meaningfulness.

Key words: Spectral Estimation; Prediction Error Identification Method; Convex Optimization; Divergence Family.

1 Introduction

In science and engineering it is often required to approximate phenomena through simple models. The quality of this approximation heavily depends on its intended use. For instance, if the purpose is prediction, then the prediction error identification method (PEM) provides the optimal model, see Ljung (1999), Söderström & Stoica (1989) and Lindquist & Picci (2015). Therefore, the more interpretations the solution of an identification method admits, the more importance such a solution gains.

In this paper, we deal with a spectral estimation problem called THREE-like method, see the former work in Byrnes et al. (2000). Such approach exploits the output covariance matrix of a filter to extract information on the spectral density of the input process. More precisely, the class of input spectral densities matching the output covariance matrix is considered and a spectrum approximation problem, which chooses an estimate of the input spectral density in this class, is then employed. Such choice is the spectral density minimizing a divergence index with respect to an *a priori* spectral density. The strength of this approach is the flexibility in choosing the filter, the divergence index and the *a priori* spectral density. In particular, choosing properly them, it is possible to recover the maximum entropy estimator (Burg, 1975) used to estimate autoregressive (AR) models.

In this paper, we show that the dual problem of the spectrum approximation problem can be seen as a new parametric spectral estimation problem wherein the optimal solution is the closest spectral density to the *correlogram*, according to a suitable weighted divergence index, and belonging to a certain parametric class. Therefore, this new interpretation enriches the meaningfulness of the optimal solution. Moreover, two specific THREE-like solutions can be also interpreted as solution to PEM. This interpretation has been observed formerly in Lindquist (2007) and Blomqvist & Wahlberg (2007) for a particular setting.

The outline of the paper follows. In section 2 we review the THREE-like approaches. In Section 3 we define two types of weighted divergence index needed to introduce, in Section 4, the interpretation of the dual problem. Finally, in Section 5 we show the link between THREE and PEM.

Throughout the paper we use the following notation. $\mathcal{Q}_n$ denotes the vector space of $n \times n$ symmetric matrices, and $\mathbb{N}_+ = \mathbb{N}\backslash\{0\}$. We drop the dependence of the domain for functions which are defined over the unit circle, for instance for spectral densities. If a function Φ is positive (semi)definite on the unit circle we write $\Phi \succ 0$ ($\Phi \succeq 0$). The shorthand notation $\int \Phi$ means the integration of Φ over the unit circle with respect to the normalized *Lebesgue* measure.

⋆ This work has been partially supported by the FIRB project "Learning meets time" (RBFR12M3AC) funded by MIUR.

Email address: zorzimat@dei.unipd.it (Mattia Zorzi).

2 A review of the THREE-like Approaches

Let $y = \{y(t)\}_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ be a $\mathbb{R}^m$-valued zero-mean stationary purely nondeterministic Gaussian process. Such a process is completely characterized by its spectral density denoted by Φ. Recall that, Φ is a $m\times m$ Hermitian-valued positive semidefinite function defined over the unit circle. We assume that Φ belongs to the set $\mathcal{S}_m^+$ of spectral densities which are bounded and coercive on the unit circle, that is there exist two scalar constants $k_1, k_2 > 0$ such that $k_1 I \preceq \Phi \preceq k_2 I$.

A THREE-like approach is a procedure to estimate Φ from a finite length sequence $\mathrm{y} = \{\mathrm{y}(t)\}_{t=1}^N$ extracted from a realization of y. It can be sketched as follows:

- Fix a filter $G(z) = (zI - A)^{-1}B$ with $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ strictly stable, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$, $n > m$, and such that the pair (A, B) is reachable. In this way, $\Sigma := \mathbb{E}[x(t)x(t)^T] \succ 0$ where $x = \{x(t)\}_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is the zero-mean stationary Gaussian process at the output of the filter G when fed by y. Then, compute an estimate $\hat{\Sigma}$ of Σ from y.
- Fix an *priori* spectral density (i.e. prior) $\Psi \in \mathcal{S}_m^+$ for y with bounded *McMillan* degree. More precisely, Ψ is designed using some given partial information on y (e.g. its zeroth moment) or using given laws describing theoretical features of y. Note that, the specification of the *prior* Ψ is not strictly necessary: if no a *priori* information is available, we set $\Psi = I$ corresponding to white Gaussian noise with variance equal to the identity (WGN), i.e. the most unpredictable process.
- The estimate of Φ is given by solving the following spectrum approximation problem

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi^\circ = \mathrm{argmin}_{\Phi\in\mathcal{S}_m^+} &\mathcal{S}(\Phi\|\Psi)\\ \text{s.t. } &\int G\Phi G^* = \hat{\Sigma}\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

  where $\mathcal{S}$ is a pseudo-distance (or divergence index) between two spectral densities in $\mathcal{S}_m^+$, that is $\mathcal{S}(\Phi\|\Psi) \succeq 0$ for any $\Phi, \Psi \in \mathcal{S}_m^+$ and equality holds if and only if $\Phi = \Psi$.

Thus, Φ° is the closest spectral density to Ψ, according to $\mathcal{S}$, matching the estimated output covariance matrix $\hat{\Sigma}$. The THREE-like approach is a generalization of the maximum entropy estimator used for AR modeling. Indeed, if we choose G as a bank of n delays, $\Psi = I$ and $\mathcal{S}$ the *Kullback-Leibler* divergence (see below), then Φ° is the spectral density matching the first n estimated covariance lags of y and maximizing the entropy rate (Cover & Thomas, 1991). It is also worth noting that Problem (1) can be seen as a rigorous recasting of the beamspace technique used to determine the direction of arrival of narrow-band emitter signals impinging on an antenna array (Vasylyshyn, 2007). In that case, y is the observation vector, x is the beamspace data vector and G is the beamforming matrix.

The filter G is designed by the user to represent known dynamics or to post-process the data y . In the latter case, this freedom represents a powerful tool to perform high resolution spectral analysis. More precisely, a higher resolution can be attained by selecting the poles of G in the proximity of the unit circle, with arguments in the range of interest (Byrnes et al., 2000; Georgiou, 2002). Finally, from G it is also possible to characterize the uncertainty set of Φ° about the actual spectral density according to a suitable notion of distance (Karlsson & Georgiou, 2013).

Regarding the computation of $\hat{\Sigma}$, we consider the procedure in Zorzi & Ferrante (2012) which is based on the characterization of Σ in terms of G and the covariance lags sequence of y. It has been shown that $\hat{\Sigma} \succeq 0$ (and $\hat{\Sigma} \succ 0$ in all simulations) and such that

$$\int G\Omega G^* = \hat{\Sigma}. \tag{2}$$

where Ω is the *biased correlogram*, possibly truncated with the *Baclman-Tukey method* (Stoica & Moses, 1997). Note that, $\Omega \succ 0$ with high probability and it represents a nonparametric spectral estimator of y. It is worth noting that Σ can be estimated setting a convex optimization problem, see Ferrante et al. (2012b), however, condition (2) does not hold with the *correlogram* but for some unknown spectral density.

The choice of the divergence index $\mathcal{S}$ has important implications in the solution Φ°, for instance it fixes the upper bound on the *McMillan* degree of Φ°. The divergence indexes proposed in the literature can be classified in three different divergence families: the Alpha, Beta and Tau divergence family. In the next sections we review the family of THREE-like solutions with these divergence families.

2.1 Solution with the Alpha Divergence Family

In Zorzi (2014b), it has been considered the Alpha divergence family

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}_A^{(\alpha)}(\Phi\|\Psi) = \mathrm{tr}\int[&\frac{1}{\alpha(\alpha-1)}\Phi^\alpha\Psi^{1-\alpha} - \frac{1}{\alpha-1}\Phi\\ &+\frac{1}{\alpha}\Psi],\quad \alpha\in\mathbb{R}\setminus\{0,1\}.\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

For $\alpha = 0$ and $\alpha = 1$, it is defined by continuity

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{\alpha\to 0}\mathcal{S}_A^{(\alpha)}(\Phi\|\Psi) &= \mathcal{S}_{KL}(\Psi\|\Phi)\\ \lim_{\alpha\to 1}\mathcal{S}_A^{(\alpha)}(\Phi\|\Psi) &= \mathcal{S}_{KL}(\Phi\|\Psi)\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $\mathcal{S}_{KL}$ is the *Kullback-Leibler* divergence

$$\mathcal{S}_{KL}(\Phi\|\Psi) = \mathrm{tr}\int[\Phi(\log\Phi - \log\Psi) - \Phi + \Psi]. \tag{5}$$

By considering the scalar case, $m = 1$, and the parametrized family $\mathcal{S}_A^{(1-\nu^{-1})}(\Phi\|\Psi)$ with $\nu \in \mathbb{N}_+$, Problem (1) admits a unique family of solutions having the following structure, see also the former works Georgiou & Lindquist (2003), Pavon & Ferrante (2006) and Ferrante et al. (2011),

$$\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\Theta},\nu} = \frac{\Psi}{(1+\nu^{-1}G^*\hat{\Theta}G)^\nu} \tag{6}$$

where $\hat{\Theta} \in \mathcal{Q}_n$ is computed solving the dual problem

$$\min\{J(\Theta),\ \Theta \in \mathcal{Q}_n \text{ s.t. } 1 + \nu^{-1}G^*\Theta G > 0\} \tag{7}$$

with

$$J(\Theta) = \begin{cases} \int \Psi\log(1+G^*\Theta G)^{-1} + \mathrm{tr}(\hat{\Sigma}\Theta), & \nu = 1 \\ \frac{\nu}{\nu-1}\int \Psi(1+\nu^{-1}G^*\Theta G)^{1-\nu} + \mathrm{tr}(\hat{\Sigma}\Theta), & \nu > 1. \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

The multivariate case $m > 1$, however, cannot be tackled with such divergence family. On the other hand, for the case $m = 1$ and $\nu = 2$, (3) is the *Hellinger* distance and it can be extended to the case $m > 1$ in such a way Problem (1) can be addressed, see Ferrante et al. (2008) and Ramponi et al. (2009).

2.2 Solution with the Beta Divergence Family

Consider the Beta Divergence Family (Zorzi, 2014a)

$$\mathcal{S}_B^{(\beta)}(\Phi\|\Psi) = \mathrm{tr}\int[\frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)}\Phi^\beta - \frac{1}{\beta-1}\Phi\Psi^{\beta-1} + \frac{1}{\beta}\Psi^\beta], \quad \beta \in \mathbb{R}\setminus\{0,1\}. \tag{9}$$

For $\beta \to 0$ and $\beta \to 1$ it is defined by continuity

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{\beta\to 0}\mathcal{S}_B^{(\beta)}(\Phi\|\Psi) = \mathcal{S}_{IS}(\Phi\|\Psi) \\ &\lim_{\beta\to 1}\mathcal{S}_B^{(\beta)}(\Phi\|\Psi) = \mathcal{S}_{KL}(\Phi\|\Psi) \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Here, $\mathcal{S}_{IS}$ denotes the *Itakura-Saito* distance

$$\mathcal{S}_{IS}(\Phi\|\Psi) = \mathrm{tr}\int[\log\Psi - \log\Phi + \Phi\Psi^{-1} - I]. \tag{11}$$

In Zorzi (2014a) and Ferrante et al. (2012a), it has been shown that Problem (1) with the parametrized divergence family $\mathcal{S}_B^{(1-\nu^{-1})}(\Phi\|\Psi)$, $\nu \in \mathbb{N}_+$, admits a unique family of solutions of the form

$$\mathcal{B}_{\hat{\Theta},\nu} = (\Psi^{-\nu^{-1}} + \nu^{-1}G^*\hat{\Theta}G)^{-\nu} \tag{12}$$

where $\hat{\Theta} \in \mathcal{Q}_n$ is computed through the dual problem:

$$\min\{J(\Theta),\ \Theta \in \mathcal{Q}_n \text{ s.t. } \Psi^{-\nu^{-1}} + \nu^{-1}G^*\Theta G \succ 0\} \tag{13}$$

with

$$J(\Theta) = \begin{cases} \mathrm{tr}\int\log(\Psi^{-1}+G^*\Theta G)^{-1} + \mathrm{tr}(\hat{\Sigma}\Theta), & \nu = 1 \\ \frac{\nu}{\nu-1}\mathrm{tr}\int(\Psi^{-\nu^{-1}} + \nu^{-1}G^*\Theta G)^{1-\nu} + \mathrm{tr}(\hat{\Sigma}\Theta), & \nu > 1. \end{cases}$$

The above solution also holds for the multivariate case, i.e. $m > 1$, however, it requires the additional assumption that $\Psi^{\nu^{-1}}$ has bounded *McMillan* degree. Finally, it is worth noting that the limit case $\beta \to 1$ has been addressed in Georgiou (2006) and it represents the first THREE-like method for the multivariate case.

2.3 Solution with the Tau Divergence Family

In Zorzi (2015), it has been proposed the Tau divergence family

$$\mathcal{S}_T^{(\tau)}(\Phi\|\Psi) = \mathrm{tr}\int[\frac{1}{\tau(\tau-1)}(W_\Psi^{-1}\Psi W_\Psi^{-*})^\tau - \frac{1}{\tau-1}\Phi\Psi^{-1} + \frac{1}{\tau}I], \quad \tau \in \mathbb{R}\setminus\{0,1\} \tag{14}$$

where W_Ψ is a left squared spectral factor of Ψ, that is $\Psi = W_\Psi W_\Psi^*$. Moreover, for $\tau \to 0$ and $\tau \to 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{\tau\to 0}\mathcal{S}_T^{(\tau)}(\Phi\|\Psi) = \mathcal{S}_{IS}(\Phi\|\Psi) \\ &\lim_{\tau\to 1}\mathcal{S}_T^{(\tau)}(\Phi\|\Psi) = \mathcal{S}_{KL}(W_\Psi^{-1}\Phi W_\Psi^{-*}\|I). \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Problem (1) with $\mathcal{S}_T^{(1-\nu^{-1})}(\Phi\|\Psi)$, $\nu \in \mathbb{N}_+$, admits a unique family of solutions of the form

$$\mathcal{T}_{\hat{\Theta},\nu} = W_\Psi(I + \nu^{-1}W_\Psi^*G^*\hat{\Theta}GW_\Psi)^{-\nu}W_\Psi^* \tag{16}$$

and $\hat{\Theta} \in \mathcal{Q}_n$ is given solving the dual problem

$$\min\{J(\Theta),\ \Theta \in \mathcal{Q}_n \text{ s.t. } I + \nu^{-1}W_\Psi^*G^*\Theta GW_\Psi \succ 0\} \tag{17}$$

with

$$J(\Theta) = \begin{cases} \mathrm{tr}\int\log(\Psi^{-1}+G^*\Theta G)^{-1} + \mathrm{tr}(\hat{\Sigma}\Theta), & \nu = 1 \\ \frac{\nu}{\nu-1}\mathrm{tr}\int(I + W_\Psi^*G^*\Theta GW_\Psi)^{1-\nu} + \mathrm{tr}(\hat{\Sigma}\Theta), & \nu > 1. \end{cases} \tag{18}$$

Note that, the above solution holds for $m \geq 1$ under the mild assumption that Ψ has bounded *McMillan* degree. Moreover, $\mathcal{T}_{\hat{\Theta},1} = \mathcal{B}_{\hat{\Theta},1}$. Finally, it is worth noting that

$$\mathcal{S}_T^{(1-\nu^{-1})}(\Phi\|\Psi) = \mathcal{S}_B^{(1-\nu^{-1})}(W_\Psi^{-1}\Phi W_\Psi^{-*}\|I). \tag{19}$$

Here, $W_\Psi^{-1}\Phi W_\Psi^{-*}$ is the spectral density of the normalized prediction error process $\tilde{\varepsilon} = \{\tilde{\varepsilon}(t)\}_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ where the actual model has spectral density Φ and the one-step ahead predictor is based on the prior Ψ. Accordingly, $\mathcal{S}_T^{(1-\nu^{-1})}(\Phi\|\Psi)$ represents a way to measure the mismatch between $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ and WGN. Therefore, (16) is also the spectral density matching $\hat{\Sigma}$ and minimizing the prediction error $\tilde{\varepsilon}$. Problem (1), however, cannot be reformulated as PEM. Indeed, in the latter the prediction error is optimized designing the one-step ahead predictor, see Section 5, rather than the shaping filter of the process.

3 Weighted Beta Divergence Families

Before to introduce our interpretation of the dual problem of the THREE-like approaches of Section 2, we need to define two different types of Beta divergence weighted according to a weight function $Q \in \mathcal{S}_m^+$. Indeed, we will see in Section 4 that the minimization of the dual function $J(\Theta)$ is equivalent to the minimization of a suitable weighted Beta divergence family. The latter measures the closeness between Ω and the THREE-like solution.

3.1 First type

We can define the weighted Beta divergence as follows

$$\mathcal{S}_{B1,Q}^{(\beta)}(\Phi\|\Psi) = \mathcal{S}_B^{(\beta)}(W_Q^*\Phi W_Q\|W_Q^*\Psi W_Q), \quad \beta \in \mathbb{R}\setminus\{0,1\} \tag{20}$$

where W_Q is a left squared spectral factor of Q, i.e. $Q = W_Q W_Q^*$. Clearly, by choosing $Q = I$ we obtain the usual Beta divergence family defined in (9).

Proposition 1 *For $\beta \in \mathbb{R}\setminus\{0,1\}$ and $Q \in \mathcal{S}_m^+$ fixed, $\mathcal{S}_{B1,Q}^{(\beta)}(\Phi\|\Phi)$ is a divergence index. Moreover, for $\beta \to 0$ and $\beta \to 1$ it can be extended by continuity*

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{\beta\to 0}\mathcal{S}_{B1,Q}^{(\beta)}(\Phi\|\Psi) &= \mathcal{S}_{IS}(\Phi\|\Psi)\\ \lim_{\beta\to 1}\mathcal{S}_{B1,Q}^{(\beta)}(\Phi\|\Psi) &= \mathcal{S}_{KL1,Q}(\Phi\|\Psi)\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

where $\mathcal{S}_{KL1,Q}$ is the weighted Kullback-Leibler divergence

$$\mathcal{S}_{KL1,Q}(\Phi\|\Psi) = \mathcal{S}_{KL}(W_Q^*\Phi W_Q\|W_Q^*\Psi W_Q). \tag{22}$$

Proof. The statement can be proved by using the same lines of Proposition 2.1 in Zorzi (2015). The unique difference regards the limit $\beta \to 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{\beta\to 0}\mathcal{S}_{B1,Q}^{(\beta)}(\Phi\|\Psi) &= \lim_{\beta\to 0}\mathcal{S}_B^{(\beta)}(W_Q^*\Phi W_Q\|W_Q^*\Psi W_Q)\\ &= \mathcal{S}_{IS}(W_Q^*\Phi W_Q\|W_Q^*\Psi W_Q) = \mathcal{S}_{IS}(\Phi\|\Psi)\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where we exploited the property, see Jiang et al. (2012),

$$\mathcal{S}_{IS}(\Phi_1\|\Phi_2) = \mathcal{S}_{IS}(W_{\Phi_2}^{-1}\Phi_1 W_{\Phi_2}^{-*}\|I) \tag{24}$$

with $\Phi_1, \Phi_2 \in \mathcal{S}_m^+$ and $\Phi_2 = W_{\Phi_2}W_{\Phi_2}^*$. ■

In view of (24), it is worth noting that $\mathcal{S}_{IS}(\Phi\|\Psi)$ represents a way to measure the mismatch between the normalized prediction error $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ defined in Section 2.3 and WGN. Finally, choosing $Q = \Psi^{-1}$ we obtain the Tau divergence family

$$\mathcal{S}_{B1,\Psi^{-1}}^{(\beta)}(\Phi\|\Psi) = \mathcal{S}_T^{(\beta)}(\Phi\|\Psi). \tag{25}$$

3.2 Second type

Another way to define the weighted Beta divergence follows

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}_{B2,Q}^{(\beta)}(\Phi\|\Psi) = \mathrm{tr}\int Q[&\frac{1}{\beta(\beta-1)}\Phi^\beta - \frac{1}{\beta-1}\Phi\Psi^{\beta-1}\\ &+\frac{1}{\beta}\Psi^\beta], \quad \beta \in \mathbb{R}\setminus\{0,1\}.\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Also in this case, setting $Q = I$ we obtain (9).

Proposition 2 *For $\beta \in \mathbb{R}\setminus\{0,1\}$ and $Q \in \mathcal{S}_m^+(\mathbb{T})$ fixed, $\mathcal{S}_{B2,Q}^{(\beta)}(\Phi\|\Phi)$ is a divergence index. Moreover, for $\beta \to 0$ and $\beta \to 1$ it can be extended by continuity*

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{\beta\to 0}\mathcal{S}_{B2,Q}^{(\beta)}(\Phi\|\Psi) &= \mathcal{S}_{IS,Q}(\Psi\|\Phi)\\ \lim_{\beta\to 1}\mathcal{S}_{B2,Q}^{(\beta)}(\Phi\|\Psi) &= \mathcal{S}_{KL2,Q}(\Phi\|\Psi)\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

where $S_{IS,Q}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{KL2,Q}$ are the weighted Itakura-Saito distance and the weighted Kullback-Leibler divergence, respectively,

$$\mathcal{S}_{IS,Q}(\Phi\|\Psi) = \mathrm{tr}\int Q[\log\Psi - \log\Phi + \Phi\Psi^{-1} - I] \tag{28}$$

$$\mathcal{S}_{KL2,Q}(\Phi\|\Psi) = \mathrm{tr}\int Q[\Phi(\log\Phi - \log\Psi) - \Phi + \Psi] \tag{29}$$

Proof. Let $\beta \in \mathbb{R}\setminus\{0,1\}$. It is not difficult to show that $\mathcal{S}_{B2,Q}^{(\beta)}(\Phi\|\Psi) \succeq 0$ and $\mathcal{S}_{B2,Q}^{(\beta)}(\Psi\|\Psi) = 0$. Assume that

$\mathcal{S}^{(\beta)}_{B2,Q}(\Phi\|\Psi) = 0$. Since $Q \in \mathcal{S}^+_m$, there exists a positive constant k such that $Q \succeq kI$. Moreover,

$$k\mathcal{S}^{(\beta)}_{B}(\Phi\|\Psi) \preceq \mathcal{S}^{(\beta)}_{B2,Q}(\Phi\|\Psi) = 0 \tag{30}$$

accordingly $\mathcal{S}^{(\beta)}_{B}(\Phi\|\Psi) = 0$ which implies $\Phi = \Psi$. We conclude that $\mathcal{S}^{(\beta)}_{B2,Q}$ is a divergence index. The same line can be exploited to show that $\mathcal{S}_{IS,Q}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{KL2,Q}$ are divergence indexes. Since it allowed to pass the limits $\beta \to 0$ and $\beta \to 1$ under the integral sign, see Zorzi (2014a), then such limits can be easily proved by using Proposition 3.1 in Zorzi (2014a). ■

Note that, for the scalar case $m = 1$ we have

$$\mathcal{S}_{IS,Q}(\Phi\|\Psi) = \mathcal{S}_{IS,Q}(W^{-1}_{\Psi}\Phi W^{-*}_{\Psi}\|I) \tag{31}$$

therefore it represents a way to measure the mismatch between the normalized prediction error $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ defined in Section 2.3 and WGN weighted according to the weight function Q. Finally, choosing $Q = \Psi^{1-\beta}$ we obtain the Alpha divergence family

$$\mathcal{S}^{(\beta)}_{B2,\Psi^{1-\beta}}(\Phi\|\Psi) = \mathcal{S}^{(\beta)}_{A}(\Phi\|\Psi). \tag{32}$$

4 The Dual Problem Interpretation

A THREE-like spectral estimator is solution to the spectrum approximation problem (1). We now show its dual problem reveals this spectral estimator also solves another spectral estimation problem. More precisely, this estimator is the closest spectral density to the correlogram Ω, according to a weighted Beta divergence family of Section 3 , and belonging to a certain parametric class. We start by considering the dual problem (17) with $\nu > 1$. Taking into account (2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} J(\Theta) &= \mathrm{tr}\int \frac{\nu}{\nu-1}(I + \nu^{-1}W^*_{\Psi}G^*\Theta G W_{\Psi})^{1-\nu} \\ &\quad + \mathrm{tr}(\int G\Omega G^*\Theta) \\ &= \mathrm{tr}\int [\frac{\nu}{\nu-1}(W^{-1}_{\Psi}\mathcal{T}_{\Theta,\nu}W^{-*}_{\Psi})^{1-\nu^{-1}} \\ &\quad + \nu\Omega W^{-*}_{\Psi}(\nu^{-1}W^*_{\Psi}G^*\Theta G W_{\Psi})W^{-1}_{\Psi}] \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

where $\mathcal{T}_{\Theta,\nu}$ has been defined in (16). Since the term $\mathrm{tr}\int \frac{\nu^2}{1-\nu}(W^{-1}_{\Psi}\Omega W^{-*}_{\Psi})^{1-\nu^{-1}}$ plays no role in the optimization with respect to Θ, we can add it to J:

$$\begin{aligned} J(\Theta) &= \mathrm{tr}\int [\frac{\nu}{\nu-1}(W^{-1}_{\Psi}\mathcal{T}_{\Theta,\nu}W^{-*}_{\Psi})^{1-\nu^{-1}} \\ &\quad + \nu\Omega W^{-*}_{\Psi}(I + \nu^{-1}W^*_{\Psi}G^*\Theta G W_{\Psi})W^{-1}_{\Psi} \\ &\quad + \frac{\nu^2}{1-\nu}(W^{-1}_{\Psi}\Omega W^{-*}_{\Psi})^{1-\nu^{-1}}] \\ &= \mathrm{tr}\int [\frac{\nu}{\nu-1}(W^{-1}_{\Psi}\mathcal{T}_{\Theta,\nu}W^{-*}_{\Psi})^{1-\nu^{-1}} \\ &\quad + \nu W^{-1}_{\Psi}\Omega W^{-*}_{\Psi}(W^{-1}_{\Psi}\mathcal{T}_{\Theta,\nu}W^{-*}_{\Psi})^{-\nu^{-1}} \\ &\quad + \frac{\nu^2}{1-\nu}(W^{-1}_{\Psi}\Omega W^{-*}_{\Psi})^{1-\nu^{-1}}] \\ &= \mathcal{S}^{(1-\nu^{-1})}_{B}(W^{-1}_{\Psi}\Omega W^{-*}_{\Psi}\|W^{-1}_{\Psi}\mathcal{T}_{\Theta,\nu}W^{-*}_{\Psi}) \\ &= \mathcal{S}^{(1-\nu^{-1})}_{B1,\Psi^{-1}}(\Omega\|\mathcal{T}_{\Theta,\nu}). \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

Consider the parametric class of spectral densities

$$\mathcal{M}_T = \{\mathcal{T}_{\Theta,\nu},\ \ \Theta \in \mathcal{D}_T\} \tag{35}$$

where the parameter matrix $\Theta \in \mathcal{D}_T = \{\Theta \in \mathcal{Q}_n \text{ s.t. } I + \nu^{-1}W^*_{\Psi}G^*\Theta G W_{\Psi} \succ 0\}$. Therefore, the dual problem (17) is equivalent to

$$\hat{\Theta} = \mathrm{argmin}_{\Theta\in\mathcal{D}_T}\mathcal{S}^{(1-\nu^{-1})}_{B1,\Psi^{-1}}(\Omega\|\mathcal{T}_{\Theta,\nu}). \tag{36}$$

Similarly, it can be proved that (36) also holds for the case $\nu = 1$. This interpretation of the dual problem allows to understand $\mathcal{T}_{\hat{\Theta},\nu}$ optimal in terms of a new spectral estimation problem.

Proposition 3 *$\mathcal{T}_{\hat{\Theta},\nu}$ is the closest spectral density to the correlogram Ω, according to $\mathcal{S}^{(1-\nu^{-1})}_{B1,\Psi^{-1}}(\Omega\|\mathcal{T}_{\Theta,\nu})$, and belonging to the parametric class $\mathcal{M}_T$.*

Similar results can be derived for the estimators $\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\Theta},\nu}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{\hat{\Theta},\nu}$.

Proposition 4 *$\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\Theta},\nu}$ is the closest spectral density to the correlogram Ω, according to $\mathcal{S}^{(1-\nu^{-1})}_{B2,\Psi^{\nu^{-1}}}(\Omega\|\mathcal{A}_{\Theta,\nu})$, and belonging to the parametric class*

$$\mathcal{M}_A = \{\mathcal{A}_{\Theta,\nu},\ \ \Theta \in \mathcal{D}_A)\} \tag{37}$$

with $\mathcal{D}_A = \{\Theta \in \mathcal{Q}_n \text{ s.t. } 1 + \nu^{-1}G^*\Theta G > 0\}$.

Proposition 5 *$\mathcal{B}_{\hat{\Theta},\nu}$ is the closest spectral density to the correlogram Ω, according to $\mathcal{S}^{(1-\nu^{-1})}_{B}(\Omega\|\mathcal{B}_{\Theta,\nu})$, and belonging to the parametric class*

$$\mathcal{M}_B = \{\mathcal{B}_{\Theta,\nu},\ \ \Theta \in \mathcal{D}_B\} \tag{38}$$

with $\mathcal{D}_B = \{\Theta \in \mathcal{Q}_n \text{ s.t. } \Psi^{-\nu^{-1}} + \nu^{-1}G^*\Theta G \succ 0\}$.

We conclude that the solution to the spectrum approximation problem (1) can be seen as the solution of a parametric spectral estimation problem wherein the best estimate is the closest one to the correlogram, according to an appropriate divergence index, and belonging to a suitable parametric class. Moreover, the *a priori* spectral density Ψ always belongs to the parametric class.

Finally, it is worth noting that the dual problem is always characterized by Beta-like divergence families. Indeed, such divergence indexes are the unique to contain a linear term in Ω corresponding to the term $\mathrm{tr}(\Theta\hat{\Sigma})$ in the dual function.

5 The connection between THREE and PEM

Consider the case $m = 1$ and $\Psi = 1$. Then, it is not difficult to see the spectral estimator $\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\Theta},1}$ (which coincides with $\mathcal{B}_{\hat{\Theta},1}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\hat{\Theta},1}$) minimizes the divergence index $\mathcal{S}_{IS}(\Omega\|\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\Theta},1})$. The latter is the relative entropy rate between two stationary Gaussian processes having spectral density Ω and $\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\Theta},1}$, respectively (Cover & Thomas, 1991). In Lindquist (2007) and Blomqvist & Wahlberg (2007) it has been shown that the minimization of the relative entropy rate is equivalent to the prediction error identification method (PEM). Therefore, $\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\Theta},1}$ is also solution to PEM. We now show this result can be extended to the case $\Psi \neq 1$ for $\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\Theta},1}$ and to the case $m \geq 1$, $\Psi \neq I$ for $\mathcal{T}_{\hat{\Theta},1}(= \mathcal{B}_{\hat{\Theta},1})$.

First, we review the PEM approach. Let $y = \{y(t)\}_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ be a $\mathbb{R}^m$-valued, zero-mean, purely nondeterministic, full rank, stationary, Gaussian stochastic process having model

$$\mathcal{P}_\Theta \ : \ y(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} F_{\Theta,k} e(t-k) \tag{39}$$

where $e := \{e(t)\}_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is the normalized innovation process, i.e. WGN, and $\{F_{\Theta,k}\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$, $F_{\Theta,k} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$, is the impulse response of the shaping filter. Moreover, $\mathcal{P}_\Theta$ belongs to the class of models

$$\mathcal{M} := \{\mathcal{P}_\Theta \mid \Theta \in \mathcal{D}\} \tag{40}$$

wherein each model is parametrized using the parameter vector (or possibly matrix) $\Theta \in D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $\varepsilon_\Theta = \{\varepsilon_\Theta(t)\}_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ be the normalized prediction error of y where the one-step ahead predictor is based on model $\mathcal{P}_\Theta$. If $\mathcal{P}_\Theta$ is the true model for y, then $\varepsilon_\Theta = e$, that is ε_Θ is WGN. On the contrary, the closer ε_Θ is to be WGN, the better $\mathcal{P}_\Theta$ describes y. Consider now the situation that a finite length sequence $\mathrm{y} := \{\mathrm{y}(t)\}_{t=1}^N$ extracted form a realization of y is given. We consider the problem to select an appropriate value $\hat{\Theta} \in \mathcal{D}$ of the parameter vector, and therefore an appropriate model $\mathcal{P}_{\hat{\Theta}} \in \mathcal{M}$, by using the information in y. The prediction error identification method judges the performance in respect to the prediction error ε_Θ of each model $\mathcal{P}_\Theta \in \mathcal{M}$ and then selects as $\hat{\Theta}$ the one with the best performance. More precisely, we consider the cost function $V(\Theta, \mathrm{y})$ which is a scalar-valued positive function of ε_Θ. Therefore, $\hat{\Theta}$ is obtained solving the following optimization problem

$$\hat{\Theta} = \mathrm{argmin}_{\Theta\in\mathcal{D}} V(\Theta, \mathrm{y}). \tag{41}$$

If we choose

$$V(\Theta, \mathrm{y}) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{t=1}^{N} \|\varepsilon_\Theta(t)\|^2 \tag{42}$$

we obtain the standard PEM (Ljung, 1999). Let L_Θ be the *Fourier* transform of the sequence $\{F_{\Theta,k}\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$. Then, $\Phi_\Theta = L_\Theta L_\Theta^*$ is the spectral density of y and is equivalent to $\mathcal{P}_\Theta$. Starting from this observation we show that the models $\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\Theta},1}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\hat{\Theta},1}$ $(= \mathcal{B}_{\hat{\Theta},1})$ can be seen as solution to (41).

5.1 *Solution* $\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\Theta},1}$

By Proposition 4, we known that $\hat{\Theta}$ is given by the minimization of $\mathcal{S}_{IS,\Psi}(\Omega\|\mathcal{A}_{\Theta,1})$ with $\Theta \in \mathcal{D}_A$. In view of (31), we have $\mathcal{S}_{IS,\Psi}(\Omega\|\mathcal{A}_{\Theta,1}) = \mathcal{S}_{IS,\Psi}(L_\Theta^{-1}\Omega L_\Theta^{-*}\|I)$ where L_Θ is such that $\mathcal{A}_{\Theta,1} = L_\Theta L_\Theta^*$. Let $\varepsilon_\Theta = \{\varepsilon_\Theta(t)\}_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ be the normalized prediction error process where the actual process has spectral density Ω and the one-step ahead predictor is based on the model $\mathcal{A}_{\Theta,1}$. It is not difficult to see that $\Lambda_\Theta = L_\Theta^{-1}\Omega L_\Theta^{-*}$ denotes the spectral density of ε_Θ. Accordingly, by choosing

$$V(\Theta, \mathrm{y}) = \mathcal{S}_{IS,\Psi}(\Lambda_\Theta\|I) \tag{43}$$

we obtain the PEM problem

$$\hat{\Theta} = \mathrm{argmin}_{\Theta\in\mathcal{D}_A} V(\Theta, \mathrm{y}). \tag{44}$$

5.2 *Solution* $\mathcal{T}_{\hat{\Theta},1}$

By Proposition 3, we have that $\hat{\Theta}$ is given by the minimization of $\mathcal{S}_{IS}(\Omega\|\mathcal{T}_{\Theta,1})$ with $\Theta \in \mathcal{D}_T$. Moreover,

$$\mathcal{S}_{IS}(\Omega\|\mathcal{T}_{\Theta,1}) = \mathcal{S}_{IS}(L_\Theta^{-1}\Omega L_\Theta^{-*}\|I) \tag{45}$$

where L_Θ is such that $\mathcal{T}_{\Theta,1} = L_\Theta L_\Theta^*$. Therefore, similarly to the previous case, we have

$$\hat{\Theta} = \mathrm{argmin}_{\Theta\in\mathcal{D}_T} V(\Theta, \mathrm{y}) \tag{46}$$

where

$$V(\Theta, \mathrm{y}) = \mathcal{S}_{IS}(\Lambda_\Theta\|I). \tag{47}$$

Here, Λ_Θ is the spectral density of the normalized prediction error process where the actual process has spectral density Ω and the one-step ahead predictor is based on $\mathcal{T}_{\Theta,1}$. Note that, in (46) we can replace $\mathcal{D}_T$ with

$\mathcal{D}_T \cap \mathcal{V}$ where $\mathcal{V}$ is a vector subspace of $\mathcal{Q}_n$. Accordingly, $\mathcal{D}_T \cap \mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{D}_T$. At this point, recall that a $\mathbb{C}^{m\times m}$-valued analytic matrix function is sparse if many of its entries are null functions, and is low-rank if its pointwise rank (constant almost everywhere) is low almost everywhere. By choosing properly G, Ψ and $\mathcal{V}$ the parametric class of models

$$\mathcal{M}_{T,\mathcal{V}} = \{\mathcal{T}_{\Theta,1},\ \ \Theta \in \mathcal{D}_T \cap \mathcal{V}\} \tag{48}$$

only contains spectral densities whose inverse is sparse (Avventi et al., 2013) or sparse plus low rank (Zorzi & Sepulchre, 2015). Such parametric classes are important in graphical modeling (Lauritzen, 1996) where the process y is "attached" to a graph: each node corresponds to a variable in y and there is a direct link between two variables if and only if are conditional dependent given the remaining variables. We conclude that also the solutions presented in Avventi et al. (2013) and in Zorzi & Sepulchre (2015) admit a PEM interpretation similar to (46).

6 Conclusions

In this paper, we have presented an interpretation of the dual problem arising from the THREE-like methods. From this interpretation it turns out that the solution to a THREE-like problem is also the closest spectral density to the correlogram over a certain parametric class. Moreover, two particular solutions can be seen also as solution to PEM.

References

Avventi, E., Lindquist, A., & Wahlberg, B. (2013). ARMA identification of graphical models. *IEEE Transaction on Automatic Control*, *58*, 1167–1178.

Blomqvist, A., & Wahlberg, B. (2007). On the relation between weighted frequency-domain maximum-likelihood power spectral estimation and the pre-filtered covariance extension approach. *IEEE Transaction on Signal Processing*, *55*, 384–389.

Burg, J. (1975). *Maximum entropy spectral analysis*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Stanford University, Palo Alto, California.

Byrnes, C., Georgiou, T., & Lindquist, A. (2000). A new approach to spectral estimation: A tunable high-resolution spectral estimator. *IEEE Transaction on Signal Processing*, *49*, 3189–3205.

Cover, T. M., & Thomas, J. A. (1991). *Information Theory*. New York: Wiley.

Ferrante, A., Masiero, C., & Pavon, M. (2012a). Time and spectral domain relative entropy: A new approach to multivariate spectral estimation. *IEEE Transaction on Automatic Control*, *57*, 2561–2575.

Ferrante, A., Pavon, M., & Ramponi, F. (2008). Hellinger vs. Kullback-Leibler multivariable spectrum approximation. *IEEE Transaction on Automatic Control*, *53*, 954–967.

Ferrante, A., Pavon, M., & Zorzi, M. (2012b). A maximum entropy enhancement for a family of high-resolution spectral estimators. *IEEE Transaction on Automatic Control*, *57*, 318–329.

Ferrante, A., Ramponi, F., & Ticozzi, F. (2011). On the convergence of an efficient algorithm for Kullback-Leibler approximation of spectral densities. *IEEE Transaction on Automatic Control*, *56*, 506–515.

Georgiou, T. (2002). The structure of state covariances and its relation to the power spectrum of the input. *IEEE Transaction on Automatic Control*, *47*, 1056–1066.

Georgiou, T. (2006). Relative entropy and the multivariable multidimensional moment problem. *IEEE Transaction on Information Theory*, *52*, 1052–1066.

Georgiou, T., & Lindquist, A. (2003). Kullback-Leibler approximation of spectral density functions. *IEEE Transaction on Information Theory*, *49*, 2910–2917.

Jiang, X., Ning, L., & Georgiou, T. (2012). Distances and Riemannian metrics for multivariate spectral densities. *IEEE Transaction on Automatic Control*, *57*, 1723–1735.

Karlsson, J., & Georgiou, T. (2013). Uncertainty bounds for spectral estimation. *IEEE Transaction on Automatic Control*, *58*, 1659–1673.

Lauritzen, S. (1996). *Graphical Models*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lindquist, A. (2007). Prediction-error approximation by convex optimization. In A. Chiuso, A. Ferrante, & S. Pinzoni (Eds.), *Modeling, Estmation and Control:Festschrift in honor of Giorgio Picci on the occation of his sixty-fifth birthday* (pp. 265–275). Springer-Verlag.

Lindquist, A., & Picci, G. (2015). *Linear Stochastic Systems: A Geometric Approach to Modeling, Estimation and Identification*. In Contemporary Mathematics. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Ljung, L. (1999). *System Identification: Theory for the User*. Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA: Prentice Hall PTR.

Pavon, M., & Ferrante, A. (2006). On the Georgiou-Lindquist approach to constrained Kullback-Leibler approximation of spectral densities. *IEEE Transaction on Automatic Control*, *51*, 639–644.

Ramponi, F., Ferrante, A., & Pavon, M. (2009). A globally convergent matricial algorithm for multivariate spectral estimation. *IEEE Transaction on Automatic Control*, *54*, 2376–2388.

Söderström, T., & Stoica, P. (1989). *System Identification*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Stoica, P., & Moses, R. (1997). *Introduction to Spectral Analysis*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Vasylyshyn, V. (2007). Antenna array signal processing with high-resolution by modified beamspace MUSIC algorithm. In *International Conference on Antenna Theory and Techniques* (pp. 455–457). Ukraine.

Zorzi, M. (2014a). A new family of high-resolution mul-

tivariate spectral estimators. *IEEE Transaction on Automatic Control*, *59*, 892–904.

Zorzi, M. (2014b). Rational approximations of spectral densities based on the Alpha divergence. *Math. Control Signals Syst.*, *26*, 259–278.

Zorzi, M. (2015). Multivariate Spectral Estimation based on the concept of Optimal Prediction. *IEEE Transaction on Automatic Control*, *60*, 1647–1652.

Zorzi, M., & Ferrante, A. (2012). On the estimation of structured covariance matrices. *Automatica*, *48*, 2145–2151.

Zorzi, M., & Sepulchre, R. (2015). AR identification of Latent-variable Graphical models. IEEE Transaction on Automatic Control, conditionally accepted.